G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

Preserve

File No. 608

192 .

Serial Nos. 1-2

( )

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos.

Part B for May22

SUBJECT.

Restoration of Godi Kaveraderahalli in the Tumkur Dy to Sri Prasanna Ranjundeswaraswami temple at Holala. Tumkur Dy.

Revenue Commissioner
Comptroller
DC Tumkur
Asst - Supdt

6-24-7.
1915-22

WD 1868—GPB—16,826—23-7 21

F. R. S. 11] 1921.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Inazrai

NOTES.

File No. 608 1921.

FILE HEADING.

Restoration of Jadi Kante Vadderhaki in the Venkata Jatra & Sri Prasanna Ranjinderswara Swami Temple at Kolala.

From

The Rev. Comr in Mysore.

C No. 1002 Dated 14.3.22 Received 15.3.22

Diary No.	Enclos. Nil	Spare Copies. —	Serial No. 1
4004			

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Recommends that the (1) Village may be taken under Govt management, and that (2) Survey and Settlement be introduced into the Village.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

The Comr under acknowledgement has first received in the Rev Secrt, and has been transferred to this Secrt for disposal of the first question

Inz. D. No. 79 of 1901 on the Subject

NOTES—First Sheet.

is submitted.

In 1667, Jodi Kanteevadeerchalli in the Hunkur Taluk was granted to Lakshmipati Shastri by His Highness the late Nanjaraja Wadiyar Bahadur for the maintenance of Sri Basava Nanjundeswara Swami Temple at Kolala. During the inam settlement, the village was, perhaps through mistake, settled as personal inam in the names of the then managers of the temple. The managers having died, disputes arose among their descendants as to the registry of the Khata of the village. The matter came up before Govt. for orders. In G.O. no. 1076-6 dy 20-9-1906, it was directed that Sitaikal Venkatakrishniah - a goldsmith - who had purchased the village for Rs 650/- might be allowed to enjoy it for 20 years from the date of the order on condition of his paying Rs 9/- annually to the temple, besides the Jodi due to Govt. after which period

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

The Jodi Village Should revert to the temple. Gold Smith Venkata Krishniah and his Sons Venkatachari and Balakrishna have executed a Stamped regd agreement on 17-8-1921 to the effect that the Village will have to revert in 1941 to the temple. According to the Rev. Canon's letter and the accompanying record, it is seen that Venkata Krishniah - the purchaser - has resigned all claims and rights in the Jodi Village from 5th July 1921. His eldest Son Venkatachari died in the recent Influenza, and his second and only surviving Son Bala Krishnachari agrees with to his father & the Village being taken over under Govt management.

Statement before the Taluk Amildar 19 8.7.21..

The Rev. Canon recommends that the Jodi Village may be taken under Govt management, Survey and Settlement being introduced into the Village.

Seeing that the Jodi Village permanently reverts to the temple, with a view to Govt future

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Serial No.

alienation, it is a point for orders whether the Jodi village should not be registered as a Devadaya inam in the khata of the temple. The S.O. of 1904 while admitting that the registry of the village as personal inam, was a mistake, states that "it is too late now to go behind the Inam settlement". Submits for orders

29.4.22.

The village may now be converted into "Devadaya" Inam, on revision of the temple. It may be taken possession of immediately instead of in 1924 when it would have fallen due, as the party in enjoyment has resigned his rights

6139-145. 4.5.22

I Member

I agree with the Hon'ble Member

6.5.22

Draft G.O. submitted

12.5.22.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

J R S. III 2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. of 19 .

Serial No	
2	No 6524 J 1919 To Re. Case of Lt. [illegible] of the Israel Decl in Copy in [illegible] [illegible] [illegible] has reached here [illegible]

NOTE—Contn. sheet

383.

OFFICE OF THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER
IN MYSORE.

C. No. 1002/12 & 19-20 Bangalore, 9th and 21st March 1922.

FROM

K.R. SRINIVASIENGAR,
Revenue Commissioner in Mysore.

GOVT. OF MYSORE
15 MAR 1922

To

The *Secretary to the Government of*
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
Revenue *Department.*

4194

REVENUE, BRANCH.

SIR,

I have the honor to refer to your letter No. 1074-3/Muz dated 30th September 1904 directing the continuance on Service Inam of Jodi Kanthavaderahalli village, Tumkur taluk, in the possession of its purchaser, Neethakal Venkatakrishnaya &c.

I have the honor to forward herewith copies of the connected noted letters, on the subject of follows:--

Tumkur Deputy Commissioner's letters No. Muz. C.167/16-17 dated 27-8-1919, 25th February 1920, 3-9-1921 and 2nd February 1922.

and this office docket No.C.1002 dated 26-5-1920 to the Deputy Commissioner.

2. The present holder Krishnaiya and his sons Chari and Ranga Chari

executed on 17th August 1906 as required in the Government Order mentioned above an agreement binding themselves to hand over Kanthavaderanalli in question to Prasannakeshava Swami temple at Kolala and to pay in the meanwhile Rs. 9 annually to the temple besides the jodi due to Government. The village was allowed to continue in possession of Venkatakrishnaiya. It was subsequently brought to the notice of the local officers that as Venkatakrishnaiya had no interest in the village, the ryots who were all powerful there used to remitted by money order the jodi and cess due to Government and enjoyed the village, keeping back the produce for the managing Inamdars, that the management of the village was

R C 4

FROM

[illegible]

Personal Commissioner in Mysore

To

The Secretary to the Government of
H H the Maharaja of Mysore,
[illegible] *Department*

Dated Bangalore, [illegible]

Despatched

Received

General No

Enclosure No

SUBJECT

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

in a very unsatisfactory condition and the temple in disrepair and neglected and that there were persons who were prepared to pay up to Rs.75/- annually if the village was lease to them Venkatakrishnaiya and his son Balakrishnaiya (later) being questioned about the relinquishment of the management of the village by them, stated in their muchalika of 20th June 1919 that he could not manage the village and that the Government might take over the management of the village provided a sum of Rs.25/- was paid to Venkatakrishnaiya annually until the expiry of the term of the lease under which he held the village. The Deputy Commissioner in reporting on the case in his letter of 27th August 1919 to this office stated that since the lessee Venkatakrishnaiya had failed to carry out his part of the contract he has forfeited his right and was not entitled to claim any compensation and that he might be ousted from his tenancy at any time; and he accordingly recommended that the village might be taken under Government management.

B

3. But, it was pointed out in this office docket No. C.1002/19-20 dated 26th May 1920.(copy of which is herewith enclosed) that as long as Venkatakrishnaiya complied with the terms of the G.O.No.1074-6/Muz. dated 20th September 1904 by paying Rs.9/- annually to the temple besides the jodi, the Government could not interfere with his possession and take up the management of the village themselves unless in the interests of the temple, he himself wished to hand over the village to Government before the stipulated period of 20 years mentioned in the Government Order, and the Deputy Commissioner was requested to enquire and submit a report as to whether Venkatakrishnaiya was willing to hand over the management of the village to Government unconditionally.

4. It is now reported by the Deputy Commissioner in his letter of 3rd September 1921 that Venkatakrishnaiya has given a statement before the Amildar on 5th July 1921 resigning all claim to and rights in the jodi village from

that date and stating that no objection to its being taken over under Government management. Balakrishna Rao is said to be the only surviving [illegible] Venkat-Krishnayya has stated before the Amildar on 6th November 1921 that he fully agrees with his father Venkatarayudu's proposal to the village being taken over under Government management but that Venkata Chari, his elder brother who was one of the parties to the agreement bond dated 17th August 1906 [illegible]

5. Under the circumstances, I beg to recommend (1) that the village in question may be taken over under Government management and that action may be also ordered to be (2) taken by the Survey Superintendent for the early introduction of survey settlement in the village.

6. The vernacular records on the subject are enclosed for reference and kind return when done with.

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Revenue Commissioner.

4007
21 22
Mur
608-21-1

M.B.R.

Sub to orders. (Kankhavedanahalli, Tumkur Tk)
The 3001 villages is recommended to be taken over under Govt. management for the benefit of the Prasanna Ranganadeswara temple at Kolala. The Lessee is agreeable to the same. It is, however, a point for orders whether this has not to be dealt with in the Muzrai Secty as the previous order is a Muzrai order, and as the present recommendation is in favor of a Muzrai institution.

I transferred to the Muzrai Secty for disposal Office 1st question

21/3/22

Letter No. Muz.C.167/16-17 dated 2nd February 1922 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

Adverting to the marginally noted references regarding the taking over of Jodi Kantnevaderahalli village, Tumkur Taluk, under Government management, I have the honor to forward herewith the file of records ending with memo. No.C.R.S.137 of 21-22 dated 29-12-1921, submitted by the Sub Division Officer, Tumkur, containing the statements of Balakrishnachari, the only surviving son of Venkatakrishnaiya, made on the 6th November 1921 and on the 27th December 1921 before the Amildar, Tumkur.

1. D.O. letter No.C.1002 G1.19-20 dated 28th January 1922 received from the Revenue Commissioner.
2. This Office letter No. Ref. on Muz.C.167 of 1916-17 dated 29th December 1921 to the Revenue Commissioner.

2. From the statement dated the 6th November 1921, it is seen that Balakrishnaiya fully agrees with his father, Venkatakrishnaiya to the village being unconditionally brought under Government management and that Venkatachari his elder brother who was one of the parties to the agreement bond dated the 17th August 1906 is since dead.

- - - - - - - -

" C o p y "

For Revenue Commissioner.

M.B.R.

Letter No. Muz. C.167/16-17 dated 3rd September 1921 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

With reference to your docket No. J.1002/19-20 dated 22nd May 1920 to enquire and to report as to whether Venkatkrishniah is willing to hand over the jodi village, Kantheyaderanally, Tumkur Taluk, unconditionally and immediately for its better control and for placing it under Government management, I have the honor to forward herewith for your kind perusal the statement given by Venkatakrishniah before the Amildar, Tumkur, on 5th July 1921 resigning all claim to and rights in the jodi village from that date and stating that he has no objection for its being brought under Government management.

The records containing the above statement (ferist No.122 and flagged A) and received from the Sub Division Officer, Tumkur, with his report No. C.R.G.593/19-20 dated 2-8-1921 accompany

- - - - - - -

" C o p y "

For Revenue Commissioner.

M.B.R.

Letter No. Muz. C.167/16-17 dated 27th August 1919 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

I have the honor to state that Jodi Kanthevadorahal.i in Tumkur Taluk assigned as inam for the Prasanna Nanjundeswara Swamy temple at Kolala was allowed to continue in the possessi n of Sastaical Venkatakrishniah as per agreement executed by him in favour of the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, on 17th August 1906 in pursuance of Government Order No.1074-6 Muz. dated 20th September 1904.

2. According to the above agreement, Venkatakrishniah had to pay annually Rs9 to the temple besides the jodi due to Government and deliver possession of the village to the temple after 20 years.

3. As the temple was not in good condition and as the management of the village was very unsatisfactory, the Amildar of Tumkur Taluk reported in his X.No.542 dated 6th November 1918 that Venkatakrishniah was a non-entity and that the villagers were all powerful and that the ryots themselves remitted the jodi and cess due to Government by money-order and that it was necessary to take the village under Government management and that there were applicants offering Rs50/- and Rs75/- annually for the lease of the village.

4. The Sub Division Officer, Tumkur, inspected the village on 20th June 1919 and reported that it is very necessary to take the village under Government management and introduce survey and settlement, early. Venkatakrishniah and his son Balakrishnxxxa Chari have given a mutchalika before him stating that as they cannot manage the village, the Government may take over the management immediately from 1919-20. The lessee Venkatakrishniah wants Rs25 to be paid to him annually till the term of the lease is over The Sub Division Officer reports that this is

out of the question now as the present income is very small but it may be convenient after the introduction of Survey and settlement.

5. Since the lessee has failed to carry out his part of the contract, he has forfeited his right and can claim ~~/~~ no compensation and can be ousted from his tenancy at any time.

6. It will be seen from the records that the ryots are practically enjoying the village paying only jodi and that they have kept back the produce due to the managing inamdars and on this account the temple has been neglected. I therefore recommend that sanction of Government may be obtained early for cancellation of the lease and assumption of management and introduction of Survey and Settlement.

7. The vernacular file of records ending with Sub Division Officer's C.R.G.472/18-19 dated 24th June 1919 is forwarded for reference and kind return.

" C o p y "

For Revenue Commissioner.

M.B.R.

Decret No. C.1002/19-20 dated [illegible] from [illegible] Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, to the Deputy [illegible] Tumkur District.

With reference to correspondence ending [illegible] letter No. C.167 Muz. dated 25th February 1920 [illegible] of bringing Jodi Kantavadeshally, Tumkur Taluk, [illegible] ment management, has the honor to observe that as long as Venkatakrishnaiya complies with the terms of the Government Order No.1074-6 Muz. dated 20th September 1904 by paying [illegible] annually to the temple besides the joda, Government [illegible] right to interfere with his possession unless [illegible] of the temple he himself wishes to hand over the village to Government before the stipulated period of 20 years mentioned in the Government Order.

2. It is further to be noted that Government cannot take over the management of the village on the score of the temple being in need of repairs on account of the ryots being too powerful and Venkatakrishnaiah being a tool in their hands.

3. If, in the interests of the temple, Venkatakrishnaiah on the other hand is willing to hand over the village to Government at once unconditionally and without claiming for himself any portion of the receipts therefrom, steps will have to be taken to take possession of it at once, otherwise the question will have to be deferred till 1924 (when the 20 years stipulated in the Government Order of 1904 will expire).

4. The Deputy Commissioner is therefore requested to enquire and to submit a report as to whether Venkatakrishnaiah is willing to hand over the village immediately.

5. The vernacular file received with his letter is returned herewith.

"Copy"

[signature]

for [illegible]

M.F.R

Letter No.Muz.C.167/16-17 dated 25th February 1920 from the Deputy Commissioner, Tumkur District, to the Revenue Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore.

- - - - - - -

In reply to your docket No. C.1002 G1. dated 1st November 1919, enquiring whether any reliable person is willing to take up the management of Jodi Kantnevaderanally, on the terms of the agreement executed by Venkatakrishnnian, or on modified terms, I have the honor to state that Mr. Suryanarayana Rao of Kolala has agreed to take up the management and to pay to Government annually P. 60/- as consideration.

2. As nobody else has come forward and as Mr. Suryanarayana Rao is a reliable person, the management of the village may be handed over to him. Out of P. 60/-, a sum of P. 9/- has to be paid to the archak as per agreement of Venkatakrishniah and out of the balance, about P. 20/- have to be deducted for jodi and cesses. Thus there will be a reserve of P. 30/-.

3. The affairs of this temple have not been investigated by the Muzarai Sheristedar. It is necessary that the management of this temple should be placed on a better footing. As funds are also required for the repairs of the institution, I recommend that the lease of the village may be given to Mr. Kolal Suryanarayana Rao till the introduction of the Survey and Settlement.

4. The vernacular file of records ending with Tumkur Sub Division Officer's C.R.G.472/18-19 dated 1st February 1920 is forwarded for reference.

- - - - - - -

" C o p y "

B Ramakrishna

r Revenue Commissione-

.B.R.

GRS VI-71]

SUBJECT Directs the restoration of the Kantevaderhalli to the Prasanna Ranjundeswara Swami temple Kolala, Nanjangud Taluk

Diary No of letter replied to

Section

File No.

Serial No

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore

, *the* *191*

Read—

Govt Pro' no. 1074-6 Dy 20th September 1904 directing that the jodi village of Kantevaderhalli endowed to Sri Prasanna Ranjundeswara Swami temple at Kolala, Nanjangud Taluk, be allowed to be enjoyed on stipulated conditions by the purchaser Venkata Krishniah for 20 years, after which period the jodi village should revert to the temple.

Date of issue

Signed by

Order thereon No

May this be

i Printed ?

ii inserted as a standing order ?

iii published in the Gazette English Part ?

iv translated ?

v placed at the disposal of the press ?

vi published in the Gazette Kannada Part ?

Letter no. C. 1002 dy 14th
March 1922 from the
Red. Commr in Mysore
reporting that both the
purchasers Venkatakrishniah
and his only surviving son
Balakrishnachari have
resigned all claim to, and
rights in, the Jodi village
from 5th July 1921, and
recommending that the
Jodi village in Sriperum-
bud may be taken under
Govt management,
survey and settlement
being introduced into the
village.

List of enclosures.

Orders thereon No 6524-7 Enc are file
Journ 608-21-2
Copied by
Examined by of 1922

under the circumstances
reported, Govt are

WD 1744—GPB—30,000—17-3-19

G. R S G/33]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

pleased to direct that that the Jodi Village of Kanteevadeshaki in question may be taken possession of immediately instead of in 1922, when it would fall due, as the party in enjoyment has resigned his rights. Survey Supdt is requested to take early steps for the introduction of Survey and Settlement into the Village.

The Inam Supdt is requested to register the Jodi Village in question as Devadaya Inam on condition to the Basavana Nanjund Swami Temple.

Dy Secy

8/12/22

Secy concerned (in charge)

The Rev. Comr. with records.

The Comptr. of S.

Dy Comr, Mysore

The Inam Supdt.

& Rev. Secy

608-21-2

D/19-8-22

WD 2230—GPB—1,00,000—23 7 20